

EXHIBIT B

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
3 (Trenton)

4 Civil Action No.: 3:22-cv-05887(RK)(JTQ)

5 JOHN DOE, :

6 Plaintiff, : DEPOSITION OF:

7 v. : COLE M. CRITTENDEN, PhD

8 PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, :

9 Defendant. :

10 X-----X

11
12
13
14 TRANSCRIPT of the testimony as taken by and
15 before CHERYL McGANN, a Certified Court Reporter of
16 the State of New Jersey, held from multiple
17 locations via Zoom Teleconference, on Thursday,
18 October 3rd, 2024, commencing at 10:33 in the
19 forenoon.
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S :

(All parties remote)

DILLON PLLC (DC)

BY: CHRISTOPHER C. MUHA, ESQ.

1717 K Street NW, Suite 900

Washington DC 20006

202-787-5871

cmuha@dillonpllc.com

Attorneys for the Plaintiff

CROWELL & MORING LLP

BY: AMANDA BERMAN, ESQ.

1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington DC 20004

202-624-2500

aberman@crowell.com

Attorneys for the Defendant

ALSO PRESENT:

CHELSEA GILCHRIST, VIDEOGRAPHER

JUSTIN DILLON, ESQ.

KIMBERLY BLASEY, ESQ.

ELI BERNIS-ZIEVE, ESQ.

1 that, never mind.

2 Did you consider in your decision at all
3 what you viewed to be the strength of the evidence
4 against John Doe? Was that a relevant factor in
5 your are calculus?

6 A. Not entirely. In other words, the role that
7 Kathleen Deignan and I played was not to make
8 determinations about strength of evidence; but,
9 rather, once those determinations have been made
10 and a panel has determined responsibility, to then
11 assign an appropriate penalty.

12 Q. Uh-huh, but so would you -- would you
13 sanction someone the same if you were, let's say,
14 95 percent convinced of their guilt as opposed to,
15 say, 51 percent, which would satisfy the preponderance
16 of evidence standard?

17 MS. BERMAN: Objection to form.

18 A. I probably would because my part in the
19 process was not to make the kind of determination
20 that you just described. My part in the process was
21 to receive a decision that a panel had made based
22 on our standard of evidence and based on all of the
23 evidence that they had looked at; and then, once
24 having received that decision, to assign an
25 appropriate penalty but not to second guess their